

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 11-22 are pending in the application. Claims 23-25 have been canceled by this submission without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-9 and 11-22 stand rejected. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Independent claim 1 relates to a method for providing functionality on a network, the network comprising nodes, the method comprising moving an agent from a first device to a target device, re-routing relevant traffic to the target device, and performing application layer gateway functionality by the agent at the target device.

Independent claim 9 relates to a network comprising a plurality of nodes, a plurality of links connecting the nodes, a mobile agent residing on a node of the network, where the mobile agent is able to function as an application layer gateway, and a route device residing on one node of the network, the route device configured to divert to the mobile agent traffic relevant to the mobile agent.

Independent claim 17 relates to a method for providing functionality on a network, the network comprising nodes, the method comprising moving an agent from a first device to a target device, re-routing a relevant data stream from a source to the target device, and at the target device, the agent accepting the data stream from the source, performing a function on the data stream, and passing the data stream to one of a set of client devices.

Independent claim 21 relates to a set of instructions residing in a storage medium, the set of instructions capable of being executed by a processor to implement a method for providing functionality on a network, the method comprising moving an agent from a first device to a target device, re-routing relevant traffic to the target device, and performing application layer gateway functionality at the target device by the agent.

In view of the above, each of the independent claims requires at least re-routing relevant traffic or a data stream to a target device, or a route device residing on one node of a network, the route device configured to divert to a mobile agent traffic relevant to the mobile agent.

Claims 1, 4-5, 7, 9, 13, 15, 17, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al. (Yama) (US 6,282,563 B1) in view of Li et al. (US 6,119,165).

Note is taken of the reference in par. 2 of the Office Action to col. 3, lines 2-7, 15-17, 51-56, col. 4, lines 7-13, 42-57, col. 5, lines 1-5, 25-28, 43-55, col. 6, lines 1-4, 8-10, 17-22, 26-28, col. 8, lines 15-21, 49-53, 58-59, col. 12, lines 27-41 of Yama as disclosing the features of "re-routing relevant traffic to the target device" and "a route device residing on one node of the network, the route device configured to divert to the mobile agent traffic relevant to the mobile agent" as required by the independent claims of the present application. However, the Applicant respectfully disagrees with this characterization of the cited passages of Yama. The cited passages of Yama do not describe the claimed features. Instead, the passages relate to nothing beyond communications between two agents. This is not re-routing of relevant traffic to a target device where an agent has been moved, as required by the independent claims of the present application. An example of the claimed arrangement is illustrated in Fig. 7 of the application and described on pages 28-29. Nothing in Yama corresponds to the illustrated arrangement. Moreover, Li et al. clearly does not remedy the deficiencies in Yama with respect to the claimed feature. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 9, 17 and 21 are allowable over Yama and Li et al. The claims dependent on these independent claims are likewise allowable, for at least the reasons discussed in connection with the independent claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 4-5, 7, 9, 13, 15, 17, 21 and 22 as unpatentable over Yama in view of Li et al. is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 11 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yama in view of Li et al. in view of Bhide et al. (US 5,852,717). As discussed above, Yama and Li et al. do not teach or suggest the features of the independent claims. Bhide et al. does not remedy the deficiencies of Yama and Li et al. discussed above. Thus, since claims 2, 11 and 18 are dependent claims, they are also allowable over Yama, Li et al. and Bhide et al. for at least the reasons discussed in connection with the independent claims. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 11 and 18 as unpatentable over Yama, Li et al. and Bhide et al. is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 12 and 19 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yama, Li et al. and Jones (US 5,832,221). Claims 6, 8, 14 and 16 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) Yama in view of Li et al. in view of Turek et al. (US 6,460,070). Claims 3, 6, 8, 12, 14, 16 and 19 are dependent claims that incorporate the features of the independent claims. As discussed above, Yama and Li et al. do not teach or suggest the features of the independent claims. Jones and Turek et al., moreover, do not remedy the deficiencies of Yama and Li et al. with respect to the independent claims. Therefore, claims 3, 6, 8, 12, 14, 16 and 19 are allowable over Yama, Li et al., Jones and Turek et al. for at least the reasons discussed in connection with the independent claims. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 3, 6, 8, 12, 14, 16 and 19 as unpatentable under section 103 over Yama, Li et al., Jones and Turek et al. is therefore respectfully requested.


The Applicant would like to bring to the attention of the Examiner co-pending application 09/565,564, filed May 4, 2000, and containing the same specification and claims as originally filed in the present application. The co-pending application has been examined and has received a first Office Action. In compliance with 37 CFR § 1.56, a copy of the "Notices of References Cited" in the Office Action, and of the references cited therein, is attached with an IDS.

In light of the foregoing discussion, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in all aspects in allowable condition, and earnestly solicits favorable reconsideration and early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 220-4323 to discuss any matter concerning this application. The Office is authorized to charge any fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17 related to this communication to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: NOV 12, 2003

By: 
William E. Curry
Reg. No. 43,572

KENYON & KENYON
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (202) 220-4200
Fax: (202) 220-4201